

**CHRISTIANSEN LAW OFFICES**  
810 S. Casino Center Blvd., Suite 104  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
702-240-7979 • Fax 866-412-6992

PETER S. CHRISTIANSEN, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 5254  
pete@christiansenlaw.com  
KENDELEE L. WORKS, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 9611  
kworks@christiansenlaw.com  
KEELY A. PERDUE, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 13931  
keely@christiansenlaw.com  
CHRISTIANSEN LAW OFFICES  
810 S. Casino Center Blvd., Suite 104  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
Telephone: (702) 240-7979  
Facsimile: (866) 412-6992  
*Attorneys for Defendant Cristiano Ronaldo*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

KATHRYN MAYORGA,  
Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:19-cv-00168-JAD-DJA

vs.

CRISTIANO RONALDO,  
Defendant.

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO SEEK LEAVE TO FILE PROPOSED DISCOVERY  
PLAN AND SCHEDULING ORDER AND EXTEND TIME TO FILE PROPOSED  
JOINT PRETRIAL ORDER (First Request)**

Pursuant to Local Rules IA 6-1 and IA 6-2, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between Plaintiff Kathryn Mayorga, through her attorney Leslie Mark Stovall, Esq., and Defendant Cristiano Ronaldo, through his attorneys, Peter S. Christiansen, Esq., Kendele L. Works, Esq. and Keely A. Perdue, Esq., that the Parties seek permission from this Court to file a proposed discovery plan and scheduling order and to extend the November 30, 2020 deadline for filing a joint pretrial order. This is the first request for such relief.

In its Order Sustaining in Part Objection and Adopting and Modifying in Part Report & Recommendation (ECF 72), this Court, in relevant part, “declined to adopt the magistrate judge’s recommendations that ... Mayorga’s mental-capacity challenge against arbitration must be

1 determined by an arbitrator...” ECF 72 AT 27:14-15. The court further concluded Mayorga failed  
2 to comply with the Federal Arbitration Act’s procedures for requesting a jury trial on the mental  
3 capacity issues, and thus, ruled the court will proceed to resolve mental capacity by way of a  
4 bench trial. ECF 72 at 23:9-10. The order instructed the parties to meet and confer, consult with  
5 the Courtroom Deputy and on or before November 30, 2020, file a “joint proposed pretrial order.”

6 The parties initially met and conferred on October 6, 2020, regarding the joint proposed  
7 pretrial order. At that time, counsel discussed the scope and parameters of the discovery each  
8 side believes is necessary to be prepared to effectively litigate the issue of mental capacity at the  
9 time of trial. While the parties dispute the scope and extent of discovery necessary to effectively  
10 try the issue of mental capacity, counsel for both sides agree some amount of discovery is needed  
11 in order to be prepared to present evidence on the relevant issues.

12 More specifically, this Court noted Mayorga provided written statements from both a  
13 psychiatrist and a therapist she treated with during the past five years, both of which opined she  
14 lacked the capacity to contract at the time she signed the subject settlement agreement. She also  
15 offered a written statement from a therapist who treated her shortly after the alleged assault and  
16 for many years thereafter. That therapist indicated she is not an expert in determining legal  
17 capacity to contract but stated she could provide “evidence relevant to the circumstances”  
18 surrounding the execution of the agreement. Lastly, the court acknowledged Mayorga provided  
19 declarations from her mother and brother, who made statements regarding Mayorga’s mental  
20 capacity both then and now. Based on the foregoing, the court concluded Mayorga, “has shown  
21 she can present evidence from which a reasonable trier of fact could conclude that she lacked the  
22 mental capacity to contract.” Counsel for both parties agree that discovery is needed to ascertain  
23 the nature and extent of any facts and evidence tending to either prove or refute that allegation.

24 For example, if Mayorga is permitted to offer expert testimony from her treating  
25 therapists, Defendant should be afforded the opportunity to depose those experts and disclose his  
26 own rebuttal expert(s). To avoid trial by ambush, both sides should have the opportunity to  
27 depose relevant fact witnesses, including Mayorga’s prior counsel and the mediator, both of  
28 whom had direct contact with Mayorga during the time in which the settlement agreement was

**CHRISTIANSEN LAW OFFICES**  
 810 S. Casino Center Blvd., Suite 104  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
 702-240-7979 • Fax 866-412-6992

negotiated and/or executed. To that end, the parties have worked together to prepare a proposed discovery plan and scheduling order setting forth their respective positions on the issue, a copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

Because both parties agree discovery is necessary to be prepared to present their respective evidence and arguments at the time of trial, Plaintiff and Defendant jointly request permission to submit Exhibit 1 for this Court's review and approval. Additionally, the parties respectfully request that consistent with the proposed discovery plan, this Court extend the November 30, 2020, joint pretrial order deadline until 60 days after the close of discovery. This request is made in good faith and not for the purposes of delay.

Dated this 20<sup>th</sup> day of November 2020

CHRISTIANSEN LAW OFFICES

// Kendelee L. Works

PETER S. CHRISTIANSEN, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 5254

KENDELEE L. WORKS, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 9611

KEELY A. PERDUE, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 13931

810 S. Casino Center Blvd., Ste. 104

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

*Attorneys for Defendant Cristiano Ronaldo*

Dated this 20<sup>th</sup> day of November 2020.

STOVALL & ASSOCIATES

// Leslie Mark Stovall

LESLIE MARK STOVALL, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 2566

2301 Palomino Lane

Las Vegas, Nevada 89107

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Kathryn Mayorga*

### **ORDER**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 24th day of November, 2020



DANIEL J. ALBREGTS

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

# Exhibit “A”

# Exhibit “A”

1 LESLIE MARK STOVALL, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 2566  
2 ROSS MOYNIHAN, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 11848  
3 STOVALL & ASSOCIATES  
4 2301 Palomino Lane  
Las Vegas, NV 89107  
5 Telephone: (702) 258-3034  
6 E-service: court@lesstovall.com  
Attorney for Plaintiff  
7

8 **UNITES STATES DISTRICT COURT**

9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 KATHERINE MAYORGA, an individual )  
11 ) 2:19-cv-00168-JAD-CWH  
Plaintiff, )  
12 vs. )  
13 )  
CRISTIANO RONALDO, individually, )  
14 Does i-XX and Roe Corporations I-XX; )  
15 Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

16  
17 **PROPOSED DISCOVERY PLAN AND SCHEDULING ORDER**

18 **(SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED)**

19 Pursuant to local Rule 26-1(a) and Rule 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,  
20 Leslie Mark Stovall, Esq. of STOVALL & ASSOCIATES, on behalf of the Plaintiff and  
21 Kendelee L. Works, Esq. and Peter Christiansen, Esq. of CHRISTIANSEN LAW OFFICES on  
22 behalf of Defendant, conducted a telephonic Rule 26(f) discovery conference on October 6,  
23 2020. The Parties submit the following Proposed Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order,  
24 pursuant to LR 26-1(b)I.  
25  
26  
27  
28

I

INITIAL DISCLOSURES

A. Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures.

Plaintiff made initial disclosures pursuant to FRCP 26 on October 26, 2019. On October 12, 2020, Plaintiff presented her proposed discovery plan to Defendant, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference as *Exhibit 1*.

B. Defendant's Initial Disclosures.

On October 12, 2020, Defendant presented his proposed discovery plan to Plaintiff, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference as *Exhibit 2*. Defendant will make his initial disclosures on or before November 30, 2020.

II

ADDITIONAL VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURES  
(Disputed)

A. Plaintiff has Agreed Provide the Following Disclosures and Releases Within 30 Days of the of a Discovery Plan:

1. Educational Records.

Plaintiff attended Clark County School District primary and secondary schools and attended University of Nevada Las Vegas. Plaintiff will provide releases of information for Clark County School District and Plaintiff will provide releases of information to any other schools or educational institutions that she intended which are not part of the Clark County School District or University Nevada Las Vegas.

2. Medical Records.

Plaintiff will provide a release of medical information for each medical provider that treated her for any medical condition that was eventually diagnosed as attention deficit disorder, depression or other psychological/psychiatric disorder.

1  
2 **3. Employment Records.**

3 Plaintiff will provide a release of employment records for each of her  
4 employers since graduation from UNLV.

5 **4. Witnesses.**

6 Plaintiff will supplement her initial disclosure list of witnesses and  
7 supplement current contact information, if known.

8 **III**

9 **DISCOVERY**  
10 **(Disputed)**

11 **A. Scope of Discovery.**

12 1. Plaintiff's position is that discovery on the issue of capacity includes the  
13 condition of Plaintiff and Defendant's knowledge of Plaintiff's condition  
14 during the period of time the settlement agreement was negotiated and  
15 entered into.

16 2. Defendant's position is that the only discovery relevant to Plaintiff's  
17 capacity to enter into the Settlement and Confidentiality Agreement  
18 ("SCA") is limited to Ms. Mayorga's medical, psychological, and cognitive  
19 functioning from June 2008 through December 31, 2010. June 2008 is one  
20 year prior to the alleged sexual assault at issue. The parties mediated this  
21 matter in January 2009, but the SCA was not fully executed until September  
22 2010. Accordingly, Defendant asserts that Plaintiff's capacity in the year  
23 prior to the alleged incident as well as throughout the negotiation and  
24 execution of the SCA are relevant to this Court's determination regarding  
25 her capacity to contract. Defendant notes that Plaintiff continues to  
26 maintain she lacks capacity, thereby arguably placing at issue her  
27 psychological and cognitive function from the negotiation and execution of  
28 the SCA through present. However, Defendant reads this Court's  
September 30, 2020 Order (ECF. 72) as intended to limit trial, and thus, the  
discovery necessary at this juncture, to only the issue of Plaintiff's legal  
capacity at the time she entered into the SCA in 2010.

Defendant further objects to Plaintiff's request to depose Defendant and/or  
his Counsel. In ECF 72, this Court affirmed the Magistrate's striking of  
documents protected by the attorney-client and work product privileges,  
which specifically stated, "Under these circumstances, the Court does not  
find that Defendant waived the attorney-client privilege by either not

1 protecting the documents from a hack or by putting them at issue in this  
 2 litigation.” ECF 67 at: 8:27-91. Likewise, Defendant has never placed his  
 3 attorney’s mental thought processes or attorney client communications at  
 4 issue and thus, Plaintiff should not be permitted to depose his counsel in an  
 5 attempt to invade such privileges. Moreover, neither Defendant nor his  
 6 counsel ever had direct communication with Plaintiff at the time of  
 mediation or negotiation of the SCA and thus, none have any knowledge  
 relevant to whether Plaintiff had legal capacity to contract during the  
 relevant timeframe.

7 **B. Plaintiff’s Proposed Discovery Plan (See *Exhibit 1*)(Disputed).**

8 **1. Supplemental disclosures.**

9 Plaintiff would make supplemental disclosures releases within 30 days of  
 10 the court’s approval of the discovery plan. Plaintiff anticipates that  
 11 collection of documents with releases or subpoenas would take  
 12 approximately 90 to 120 days due to delays caused by the COVID – 19  
 13 pandemic, the national election and winter holidays. Both parties agree to  
 14 supplement disclosures with documents and witnesses, including all  
 documents collected by use of releases or subpoenas, no later than 120 days  
 from the court’s approval of a discovery plan – that is on or before

15 **2. Depositions.**

16 Plaintiff seeks the deposition of the following witnesses regarding their  
 17 observations of Plaintiff’s behavior:

- 18 a. John Lavelly, Jr., Esq.
- 19 b. Yael E. Holtkamp, Esq.
- 20 c. Paulo Rendeiro, Esq.
- 21 d. Francisco Cortez, Esq.
- 22 e. Carlos Osario De Castro, Esq.
- 23 f. Richard Wright, Esq.
- 24 g. Joseph Bongiovi, Esq.
- 25 h. Micheala Woods, Esq.

26 Plaintiff would commence depositions within 30 days of the court’s  
 27 approval of a discovery plan. Plaintiff anticipates completion of depositions  
 28



1 would take 120 to 180 days due to travel restrictions in North America and  
2 Europe. Plaintiff would agree to digital/video depositions to shorten the  
3 time needed to complete depositions.

4 **3. Written Discovery.**

5 Written discovery permitted by FRCP 31,33, 34, and 36. Plaintiff reserves  
6 the opportunity to apply to the court for examination of documents and  
7 electronic equipment pursuant to FRCP 35.

8 **4. Expert Disclosures.**

9 Plaintiff suggests that expert disclosures be made within 60 days of the  
10 collection of documents following supplemental disclosures, 30 days for  
11 rebuttal expert disclosures and 30 days thereafter for expert depositions.  
12 That would be 150 to 180 days from the court's approval of a discovery  
13 plan for initial expert disclosures, 180 to 210 days for disclosure of rebuttal  
14 expert opinions and 210-240 days to conduct depositions of experts.

15 **5. Close of Discovery.**

16 Close of discovery to correspond with the last date for expert depositions.  
17 That would be 210 to 240 days from the date of the court's approval of a  
18 discovery plan.

19 **6. Dispositive Motions.**

20 Plaintiff suggests that dispositive motions be filed within 45 days of close  
21 of discovery.

22 **C. Defendant's Proposed Discovery Plan (Disputed)**

23 **1. Defendant's Initial Disclosures**

24 Defendant will make initial disclosures on or before November 30, 2020.

25 **2. Plaintiff's Records.**

26 Defendant seeks releases/authorizations for records from Plaintiff's  
27 employers, the IRS, medical, psychological and/or counseling providers  
28 from June 2008 to December 31, 2010. Defendant proposes that Plaintiff  
provide these authorizations on or before November 30, 2020.

### 3. Supplemental Disclosures.

Defendant proposes that Plaintiff provide supplemental disclosures on or before November 30, 2020. Plaintiff identified 66 potential witnesses in her Initial Disclosures, several of which appear to be Plaintiff's family, friends and/or acquaintances but are listed generally as being "expected to testify the [sic] facts and circumstances surrounding the sexual assault that is subject of this lawsuit," and for which no contact information is provided. Defendant requests that Plaintiff provide supplemental disclosures to identify those witnesses that may have knowledge that is relevant and/or likely to lead to the discovery of relevant and/or admissible evidence probative of Plaintiff's mental state and capacity during the relevant time frame. Defendant further requests that Plaintiff provide current contact information for all such witnesses, as well as her medical providers, psychological and/or counseling providers, and employers and supervisors from June 2008 to December 31, 2010.

### 4. Close of Discovery.

Defendant proposes the close of discovery as June 30, 2021. Consistent with LR 26-1(b)(1), this date is 180 days from the date on which Plaintiff will provide supplemental disclosures and authorizations for the release of relevant records.

### 5. Depositions.

Defendant intends to take depositions of the following individuals regarding their knowledge of Plaintiff from June 2008 to December 31, 2010:

- a. Plaintiff Kathryn Mayorga
- b. Friends and family of Plaintiff as identified by Plaintiff as having knowledge regarding Plaintiff's behavior and mental capacity during the relevant timeframe.
- c. Plaintiff's medical providers during the relevant timeframe, including but not limited to her psychological and/or counseling providers.
- d. Plaintiff's employers and supervisors.
- e. Micaela Rustia Moore (formerly known as Micaela Trammel and/or Micaela Wood) (Plaintiff's attorney during the mediation and settlement negotiations giving rise to this litigation).

- f. Joseph Bongiovi, Esq. (the mediator who conducted the mediation that lead to the SCA at issue in this litigation).
- g. Norton A. Roitman, M.D.
- h. Tammie S. Roitman, EDS, CCHT
- i. Nancy Sargent Hunterton, MFT
- j. Jane Heenan, MS, MFT
- k. Any expert witnesses to be disclosed by Plaintiff
- l. Any other witnesses later identified that may possess knowledge relevant to Plaintiff's mental capacity during the relevant timeframe.

**6. Written Discovery.**

Defendant intends to propound written discovery permitted by FRCP 31,33, 34, and 36. Defendant reserves the right to seek an Order allowing a Rule 35 medical examination of Plaintiff.

**7. Expert Disclosures.**

Consistent with FRCP 26(a)(2), Defendant proposes that initial expert disclosures be made on or before March 30, 2021, with rebuttal expert disclosures due on or before April 30, 2021.

**8. Dispositive Motions.**

Pursuant to LR 26-1(e)(4), Defendant proposes that dispositive motions be filed within 30 days of close the of discovery, that is, on or before July 30, 2021.

**9. Trial Setting:**

Defendant requests that a bench trial as to the limited issue of Plaintiff's legal capacity to enter into the SCA be set at the Court's convenience, at a time not less than 60 days from this Court's ruling on any dispositive motions to be filed.

**IV**  
**ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATIONS**

The Parties hereby certify as follows:

1. Alternative Dispute Resolution: Counsel for Plaintiff and Defendant have met and conferred about the possibility of using alternative dispute resolution processes including mediation, arbitration and if applicable, early neutral evaluation. The Parties further note Plaintiff has filed a notice of appeal with the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, resulting in the matter being referred to the Ninth Circuit Mediation Program.
2. Alternative Forms of Case Disposition: Counsel for Plaintiff and Defendant have considered consent to trial by a magistrate judge under 28 U.S.C. 636(c) and FRCP 73.
3. Electronic Evidence: Counsel for Plaintiff and Defendant discussed whether they intend to present evidence in electronic format at the time of trial and no stipulations have been reached as of this time.

**V**  
**SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED**


The Parties are unable to resolve the disputes identified above and therefore request a special scheduling review pursuant to LR 26-1 (a).

DATED This 19 day of November, 2020

DATED This \_\_\_ day of November, 2020

STOVALL AND ASSOCIATES

CHRISTIANSEN LAW OFFICES

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Leslie Mark Stovall, Esq.  
Nevada Bar. No. 2566  
2301 Palomino Lane  
Las Vegas, NV 89107  
*Attorney for Plaintiff*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Peter S. Christiansen, Esq.  
Nevada Bar No. 1656  
810 S. Casinos Center Blvd., Suite 104  
Las Vegas, NV 89101  
*Attorneys for Defendant*